



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,622	06/28/2001	Dai Miyawaki	826.1733	4876
21171	7590	02/06/2008		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/892,622

Applicant(s)

MIYAWAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 5-9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 32-36 and 41-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 5-9, 12, 14-15, 18, 20-21, 24, 26-27, 32-36, 41-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 11/20/07 to the application filed on 6/28/01, priority 6/28/00.
2. Claims 1-2, 4, 10-11, 13, 16-17, 19, 22-23, 25, 28-30, 37-40 are canceled.
3. Claims 3, 5-9, 12, 14-15, 18, 20-21, 24, 26-27, 31-36, and 41-45 are pending in the case. Claims 3, 12, 18, 24 are independent claims.
4. The 103 rejections of the pending claims have been withdrawn in view of the amendment to the independent claims 3, 12, 18 and 24.

Priority

5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 3, 5-9, 12, 14-15, 18, 20-21, 24, 26-27, 32-36, 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierle, *BricsNet Acquires Leading Online Provider of Building Industry*, Business Wire, Oct 26, 1999, page 1 (pgs 1-3 as printed from ProQuest) in view of Cunningham, *Built for Existing Users not the First-Timer*, Computing Canada, August 5, 1997, vol. 23, Iss. 16, pg.28, 2 pgs (pages 1-3 as printed from ProQuest), Puttre, *CAD vendors wrap engineers in the World Wide Web*, Design News, Feb 17, 1997, vol. 52, Iss. 4, pg. 58, 4 pgs (pages 1-5 as printed from ProQuest), Yamada et al. (US 5,642,286, 6/24/97) and Smith, *Collaborate on the Web*, CADalyst, Feb 1999, vol. 16, Iss. 2, pg. 58, 6 pgs (pages 1-8 as printed from ProQuest).

Regarding independent claim 12, Stierle discloses:

- obtaining a dragging-and-dropping operation of said various CAD parts data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client
(**page 2:** "... BricsNet's new architectural software for IntelliCAD and AutoCAD will enable users to insert specifications and CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-drop operation ...")

- inserting the CAD parts data into the application of the client by dragging and dropping or copying and pasting the image data displayed on the Web browser in the client (**page 2**: “.. *BricsNet's new architectural software for IntelliCAD and AutoCAD will enable users to insert specifications and CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-drop operation ...*”)

Stierle does not disclose obtaining a copying-and-pasting operation of various CAD parts data as applied to the dragging-and-dropping operation.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Stierle to include the copying-and-pasting operation since it is well known in the art to use the copying-and-pasting operation for modifying data.

Stierle also does not disclose obtaining, together with the various CAD parts data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client, URLs in which said various CAD parts data are published and information relating to said various CAD parts data as attributes of said various CAD parts data.

Cunningham discloses that the CAD drawings, when saved in DWF (Drawing Web Format), can be posted to a web page with the URLs attached to the drawings (**page 2**: “.. *By saving drawings in DWF (Drawing Web Format), you can post them to a Web page where they can be viewed with a plug-in. URLs can also be attached to your drawings ..*”). Cunningham does not disclose information relating to said various CAD parts data as attributes of the CAD parts data.

Puttre provides hot links that a user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3). This shows that the hot links which include URLs and the balloons representing information of the detailed parts of the drawings, which are equivalent to the CAD parts, are managed so that the CAD parts can be displayed according to a user's request via clicking action.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Cunningham into Stierle for the following reason. Puttre discloses managing the hot links of the detailed parts of a drawing so that said parts can be displayed as user's desire via clicking providing the advantage to incorporate into Cunningham and Stierle for effectively managing not only the CAD image but also the CAD parts, which are the detailed parts of the image, to provide users with useful detailed images.

Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre do not disclose displaying said various CAD parts data in the application of the client at the position of the mouse cursor in a rubber-banding format.

Yamada discloses displaying CAD parts data in the application of the client at the position of the mouse cursor in a rubber-banding format (col 9, lines 25-59, col 10, lines 23-56, line 57 to col 11, line 50).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill at the time of the invention was made to have combined Yamada into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre since Yamada discloses displaying CAD data at the client at the position of the mouse cursor in a rubber-

banding format thus motivating to incorporate into the CAD data in Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre for having an effective way for graphically displaying CAD data.

Cunningham further discloses that the URLs are added automatically (**page 2**: “.. By saving drawings in DWF (Drawing Web Format), you can post them to a Web page where they can be viewed with a plug-in. *URLs can also be attached to your drawings* ..”; this shows that the URL is added to the drawing automatically when the drawing is posted).

Stierle, Cunningham, Puttre, Yamada do not disclose:

- wherein the URLs in which said various CAD parts data are published and the information relating to said various CAD parts data are updated

Smith discloses a Web collaboration tools for CAD users by providing a virtual work site where the users can share and discuss designs, revisions, and project documents via the Internet as well as keep track design changes (pages 1, 4). Smith further discloses showing changes made to drawings on the meeting held over the Web with simultaneous discussion (page 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre for the following reason. The fact that Smith discloses showing changes made to drawings suggests updating information about a web page corresponding to each URL in the URL list since each part of the drawings has a corresponding URL and thus, updating the drawings leads to updating the information about the corresponding web page. The

combination of Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, Puttre, and Yamada would help effectively updating engineering information over the Internet.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Stierle discloses that when the CAD parts data is dropped or pasted from the Web browser, the data is automatically converted into a CAD application format of the client and then inserted (**page 1**: “..*BricsNet's new architectural software for IntelliCAD and AutoCAD will enable users to insert specifications and CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-drop operation ...*”; the fact that users can insert CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-drop operation inherently shows that the CAD data is automatically converted into a CAD application format of the client before inserting since it is clear that their design is in AutoCAD application).

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, Stierle does not disclose referring to an original Web pages based on a URL managed as an attribute of the parts data inserted into the CAD application.

Cunningham discloses posting the CAD drawings in web format to the Internet with their attached URLs (page 2).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cunningham into Stierle for the following reason. The fact that Cunningham discloses posting the CAD drawings with their URLs to the Internet suggests that the URLs can be used as the attributes of the CAD drawings to *refer to*

the original Web page where the CAD drawings are posted. This provides the advantage to incorporate into Stierle for easily tracking the original of the CAD data when exporting the CAD data to the Internet or dropping the CAD data from the Internet to any application at client.

Claims 3, 5-6 are for a system of method claims 12, 14-15, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 18 and 24 are for a computer readable medium and a program of method claim 12, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 20 and 26 are for a computer readable medium and a program of method claim 14, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 21 and 27 are for a computer readable medium and a program of method claim 15, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose generating a URL list from a URL managed as an attribute of plural pieces of CAD parts data inserted into the CAD application.

Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include generating a URL list from a URL managed as an attribute of plural pieces of CAD parts data displayed on the Web for the following reason. Puttre discloses that a CAD drawing might have hot links represented by the balloons so that a user can click on these balloons for retrieving the display of the detailed drawing. This suggests that the hot links of the detailed drawings be in the list of URLs that includes the URL of the main CAD drawing since the detailed drawings and the main CAD drawing are from a same web page. In other words, Puttre suggests a URL list generated from a URL managed as an attribute of plural pieces of CAD parts data.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham since Puttre suggests a list of URL from a URL managed as an attribute of plural pieces of CAD parts data providing the advantage to incorporate into Stierle and Cunningham for inserting plural pieces of CAD parts data with their URLs into client via dragging and dropping operation.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Stierle, Cunningham, Puttre, Yamada do not disclose obtaining update information about a Web page corresponding to each URL of the URL list, and notifying a user of the information.

Smith discloses a Web collaboration tools for CAD users by providing a virtual work site where the users can share and discuss designs, revisions, and project documents via the Internet as well as keep track design changes (pages 1, 4). Smith further discloses showing changes made to drawings on the meeting held over the Web with simultaneous discussion (page 2). Smith also discloses sending email notification for specific event and use instant messaging for approval and revision request (page 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre for the following reason. The fact that Smith discloses showing changes made to drawings suggests updating information about a web page corresponding to each URL in the URL list since each part of the drawings has a corresponding URL and thus, updating the drawings leads to updating the information about the corresponding web page.

Also, the fact that Smith discloses using email for notifying specific event suggests notifying the updated information to users in addition to notifying specific event to users via email. The combination of Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, Puttre, and Yamada would help fast updating engineering information in the Internet as well as fast notifying the updated information to users.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose obtaining updated information on a Web page corresponding to the inserted CAD parts data using a URL managed as an attribute of the inserted CAD parts data, and reflecting a change of information about the inserted CAD parts data.

Smith provides a virtual work site where the users can share and discuss designs, revisions, and project documents via the Internet as well as keep track design changes (pages 1, 4). Smith further discloses showing changes made to drawings on the meeting held over the Web with simultaneous discussion (page 2). Smith also discloses sending email notification for specific event and use instant messaging for approval and revision request (page 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Smith into Stierle and Cunningham for the following reason. The fact that Smith provides revisions and design changes via the Internet suggests updating the information of the web page containing the designs and reflecting the change of information about the CAD drawings on the Internet. This also suggests that changes to CAD drawings should be shown when the CAD drawings are dropped to the client. The combination of Smith into Stierle and Cunningham would help fast updating engineering information in the Internet and fast notifying the updated information to users.

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that the URL and information are managed as a list of attributes of the CAD parts data.

Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon included in the CAD drawing for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include managing the URL and information as a list of attributes of the CAD parts data for the following reason. Puttre discloses clicking on a selected hot link represented by a balloon included in the CAD drawing to retrieve a desired drawing detail shows that the URL and the name of the hot link or balloon for each drawing detail are managed as attributes of the CAD parts data to be displayed to users. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham for conveniently accessing and retrieving only CAD parts needed instead of retrieving and downloading the whole CAD image, which takes unnecessary spaces in transmitting as well as storing.

Regarding claim 33, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that the attributes include the URL and a title of the page at the URL.

Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include the URL and a title of the page at the URL since the hot links name and the URL associated with the hot link are considered as attributes of an instant CAD part of a CAD drawing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham for quickly accessing and retrieving only CAD parts needed instead of retrieving the whole CAD image, which takes unnecessary spaces in transmitting as well as storing.

Regarding claim 34, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose explicitly:

- discarding the CAD parts data when use of the application is finished
- using the URL to obtain the CAD parts data as needed for subsequent uses of the application

Puttre discloses hot links associated with the CAD parts of a CAD image (page 3) where the URLs included in the hot links are addresses for accessing and retrieving the corresponding CAD parts.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Cunningham and Stierle since Puttre teaches the

hot links including the URLs corresponding to the CAD parts providing the advantage to incorporate into the URL of the CAD image in Cunningham and Stierle for further obtaining the CAD parts data by simply accessing the provided URLs of the CAD parts. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Stierle, Cunningham and Puttre to include discarding the CAD parts data when use of application is finished since it was well known in the art to delete data not in use for saving memory as well as speeding the application process.

Regarding claim 35, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose updating the URL and other information associated with a drawing.

Smith discloses a Web collaboration tools for CAD users by providing a virtual work site where the users can share and discuss designs, *revisions*, and project documents via the Internet as well as keep track design changes (pages 1, 4). Smith further discloses showing changes made to drawings on the meeting held over the Web with simultaneous discussion (page 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre for the following reason. The fact that Smith discloses showing *changes made to drawings* with *simultaneous discussion* implies that updating CAD image corresponding to each URL and other information associated with the CAD drawings is performed. The combination of Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre would help fast updating

CAD drawings as well as related CAD information in the Internet to provide the newest CAD information to users.

Regarding claim 36, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that the image is comprised of a plurality of parts each associated with a separate URL.

Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include a plurality of CAD parts each associated with a separate URL for the following reason. Puttre discloses that a CAD drawing might have hot links represented by the balloons so that a user can click on these balloons for retrieving the display of the detailed drawing. This suggests that the drawing details be CAD parts with associated hot links, which are associated URLs.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham since Puttre discloses plural pieces of CAD parts with associated hot links providing the advantage to incorporate into Stierle and Cunningham for conveniently accessing and retrieving only CAD parts needed instead of retrieving the whole CAD image, which takes unnecessary spaces in transmitting as well as storing.

Regarding claim 41, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle does not disclose that one or more URLs are attached to the CAD parts data.

Cunningham discloses that the URL is added automatically (**page 2**: “.. By saving drawings in DWF (Drawing Web Format), you can post them to a Web page where they can be viewed with a plug-in. *URLs can also be attached to your drawings ..*”; this shows that the URL is added to the drawing automatically when the drawing is posted). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cunningham into Stierle since Cunningham discloses attaching URL to drawings posted on the Internet providing the advantage to incorporate into Stierle for easily recognizing the website containing the posted drawing and conveniently retrieving related drawings if needed.

Regarding claim 42, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle does not disclose that the URL is added automatically to a CAD format image.

Cunningham discloses that the URL is added automatically (**page 2**: “.. By saving drawings in DWF (Drawing Web Format), you can post them to a Web page where they can be viewed with a plug-in. *URLs can also be attached to your drawings ..*”; this shows that the URL is added to the drawing automatically when the drawing is posted). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cunningham into Stierle since Cunningham discloses attaching URL to drawings posted on the Internet providing the advantage to incorporate into

Stierle for easily recognizing the website containing the posted drawing and conveniently retrieving related drawings if needed.

Regarding claim 43, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that the list of the attributes of the CAD parts data is used.

Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon included in the CAD drawing for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognized that the attributes of the CAD parts data are used since the hot links with associated URLs and names, which are attributes of the CAD drawings, are used to retrieve a desired drawing detail.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham for conveniently accessing and retrieving only CAD parts needed instead of retrieving and downloading the whole CAD image, which takes unnecessary spaces in transmitting as well as storing.

Regarding claim 44, which is dependent on claim 43, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that a particular item belonging to said list is highlighted.

As mentioned in 43, Puttre discloses that the attributes of the CAD drawings are used to retrieve the further drawing details.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include highlighting a particular item, which is one of the attributes of a CAD data since it was well known to highlight a URL for selecting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham for conveniently accessing and retrieving only CAD parts needed instead of retrieving and downloading the whole CAD image, which takes unnecessary spaces in transmitting as well as storing.

Regarding claim 45, which is dependent on claim 43, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that the CAD parts data is deleted with the termination of the application, and required data is obtained from the URL with the next use.

Puttre discloses hot links associated with the CAD parts of a CAD image (page 3) where the URLs included in the hot links are addresses for accessing and retrieving the corresponding CAD parts.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Cunningham and Stierle since Puttre teaches the hot links including the URLs corresponding to the CAD parts providing the advantage to incorporate into the URL of the CAD image in Cunningham and Stierle for further obtaining a required CAD parts data by simply accessing the provided URLs of the CAD parts. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Stierle, Cunningham and Puttre to include

deleting the CAD parts data with the termination of the application since it was well known in the art data is lost, which means disappeared, when terminating an application.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/20/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the cited references do not disclose the claimed limitations:

- Puttre does not disclose "obtaining together with the various CAD parts data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client, URLs in which said various CAD parts data are published and information relating to said various CAD data as attributes of said various CAD parts data" (Remarks, page 8)
- Yamada does not disclose said various CAD parts data in the application of the client at the position of the mouse cursor in a rubber-banding format (Remarks, pages 9-13)

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The CAD images when posted on the Internet with associated balloons representing information of detailed parts of the drawings, which are CAD parts, as disclosed in Puttre is obtained via a user's clicking action.

Regarding to Yamada, it is noted that the wiring CAD apparatus is an apparatus designed interactively to improve the technique of displaying a *design object* (col 1, lines 6-12, col 9, lines 25-49) and the wiring CAD apparatus uses a mouse to perform CAD wiring (col 1, lines 35-67). Yamada further discloses the display of a rubber band on a design object on a display section by wiring design (col 9, line 50 to col 10, line 14). Yamada also discloses allowing wiring designing on wiring design object to be performed interactively at a wiring start point (col 11, lines 42-67). Since a design object in Yamada is a CAD object, the wiring CAD apparatus wiring a rubber band for a design object on the display section, and the object design wiring is performed *interactively* at the wiring start point *using a mouse*, Yamada discloses the argued feature.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wynblatt et al. (US 6,018,710). Bertram et al. (US 6,049,812).

Cote et al. (US 7,283,135). Tokui (US 2001/0029510).

Suda (US 2001/0047404). McCloskey et al. (US 2002/0026385).

Cheng (US 2003/0005130).

Xu et al., A Web-enabled PDM system in a collaborative design environment, Google March 2003, pages 1-16.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Application/Control Number:
09/892,622
Art Unit: 2178

Page 22

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Cong-Lac Huynh/
Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
01/31/08